

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the remarks and amendments herewith. The present Response is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 12-14, 23, 24, 28-31, 34-36, 45-47 and 49 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 9, 12, 23, 24, 28, 31, 34, 45-47 and 49, which are independent, are hereby amended. No new matter has been added. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112 beyond the remarks. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-2, 7, 9, 12, 13, 23-24, 28, 29, 31, 34, 35, 45-47 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,195,090 to Riggins, III (hereinafter, merely "Riggins") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0090217 to Limor et al. (hereinafter, merely "Limor") and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0042105 to Koehler, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Koehler") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,608,649 to Suzuki, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Suzuki")

Claims 8, 14, 30 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Riggins in view of Limor, Koehler, and Suzuki and further in view of US 2005/0198668 A1 to Yuen, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Yuen”).

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

...a display for displaying a plurality of modes and a plurality of display objects,

wherein each of the plurality of display objects is related to the selection of one of the plurality of modes,

wherein when one of the display objects is selected, the related mode is displayed,

wherein each of the plurality of display objects related to the selection of each of the plurality of modes for display purposes are all displayed simultaneously,

wherein each of the plurality of modes designated by each of a plurality of user selected display objects are displayed simultaneously, and

Support for the above-identified features is provided at paragraph [0153] of the Specification as originally filed, which are reproduced below:

[0153] FIG. 12 shows an example of display of a case where these mode items were selected. In case of FIG. 12, the image 85 of a channel selected as a main screen, a mapping screen 86 showing the positions of vehicles being movable bodies and imaging cameras that are mapped on a map, and a profile screen 87 the contents of which are the lap time, the speed and the other time data of each vehicle, personal results and the other personal information are displayed on the screen.

Claim 1 recites “the plurality of modes comprising: a mode for displaying a specific object chasing function, a mode for displaying a view from a specific camera, a mode for displaying specific profile information, and a mode for mapping positions of a plurality of movable bodies on the map and displaying a positional relationship between the movable bodies on the screen as a function of the multiplexing processing section, wherein the display objects related to the selection of each of the plurality of modes for display purposes are all display simultaneously, **wherein each of the plurality of modes designated by each of a plurality of user selected display objects are displayed simultaneously**”

Applicants submit that Riggins, Limor, Koehler, and Suzuki, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest or render predictable the above-identified features of Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to similar recitations of independent claim 1, independent claims 2, 9, 12, 23, 24, 28, 31, 34, 45-47 and 49 are patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of the statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 

Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
Russell P. Blaise
Reg. No. 66,567
(212) 588-0800